

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/593,269</p>	<p>Applicant(s) CASTALDI ET AL</p>
<p>Examiner Laura L. Stockton</p>	<p>Art Unit 1626</p>	

All Participants:

(1) Laura L. Stockton

(2) Robert B. Murray (Reg. No. 22,980)

Date of Interview: 15 January 2010

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
 30 and 33-37

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
The Examiner called Applicant's representative and left a message with Mr. Murray's secretary requesting permission to: (1) subscript the "3" in the R(3) variable in formulas VII and VIII in claim 30; and cancel claims 33-37, which is directed to the non-elected subject matter of Group II. Mr. Murray called the Examiner on Tuesday, January 19, 2010 at 9:43am and indicated that he could not give me an answer at this time since Applicant needed more time to consult with him. The Examiner indicated that the application was an amended due case and an action would have to be prepared.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Laura L. Stockton/

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)